

REMARKS

Claims 1–11 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,215,982 to Trompower (“Trompower”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,133,666 to Arai (“Arai”). Claims 4-6, 8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) over Trompower in view of Arai and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,184 to Machida (“Machida”). Applicants traverse and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal all the rejections.

Claims 1-3, 7 and 9 are rejected under § 103(a) over Trompower in view of Arai. Independent claim 1 recites “plural control processors for controlling said plural transmission-reception portions” and that “said central processor controls said plural control processors *to select said transmission-reception portion.*” (Emphasis added). Trompower fails to teach this limitation. At page 4 the Office Action alleges that column 11, line 12 to column 12 line 21 of Trompower teaches “a processor to select the transmission-reception portion... is selected and switch main transceiver to selected channel.” Applicants agree that Trompower’s transceiver is switched to a selected channel, but disagree that the transceiver is selected as claim 1 requires. To the contrary, Trompower states that its microprocessor “*select[s] a new channel* on which the main transceiver 201 can [is to] operate.” See column 11 lines 20-23 and 49-51 (emphasis added). Thus Trompower teaches selecting *a channel* on which the *same transceiver* is to operate, not “controlling said plural control processors to select *said transmission-reception portion,*” among plural transmission-reception portions as required by claim 1. As nothing in Arai cures Trompower’s deficiency as applied to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as 2-3, 7 and 9, which ultimately depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance and urges reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections thereto.

Claims 4-6, 8 and 10-11 are rejected under § 103(a) over Trompower and Arai in view of Machida.

As an initial matter, Applicants again urge that the rejection of claim 11 is improper, as Applicants pointed out in the prior response. As previously noted, while independent claims 1 and

4 recite “a central processor for controlling said plural control processors,” independent claim 11 does not include this limitation. At page 5, paragraph 4 the Office Action still rejects claim 11 by alleging that “Trompower and Arai teach all limitations as explained above in claim 1.” Yet Arai is only cited for the above-recited limitation of claims 1 and 4, *which is not included in independent claim 11*. Because Arai is cited against a limitation which is not contained in claim 11, the rejection of claim 11 over Arai in combination with Trompower and Machida still unclear and improper.

Claims 4 recites “wherein said central processor controls said plural control processors so that prescribed transmission-reception portions are paused for a time zone in which the communication load is low.” Claim 11 recites: “pausing prescribed transmission-reception portions by said control processors for a time zone in which the communication load is low. The Office Action admits that Trompower and Arai fail to teach these limitations, citing to column 2, lines 50-68 of Machida. Machida is also deficient against these limitations.

At the portion cited by the Office Action, Machida describes a traffic distribution system that monitors channel usage in a base station, and then sends a channel selection re-execution instruction to a mobile terminal unless available channel usage is too low, which is based on a traffic distribution threshold. Machida only shows that it will not transmit a specific re-execution instruction to a mobile unit if there is too much channel usage in a base station. Otherwise, Machida’s system allows the mobile terminal to communicate on the channel. Machida is silent about the activity of the transmission-reception portions, except by inference insofar as it indicates that the channels in the base station are occupied. (Indeed, Machida’s channels in the base station are described as constantly occupied by some mobile terminal.) Accordingly, Machida is wholly silent on pausing any transmission-reception portion in a base station device, much less doing so for a time zone in which the communication is low.

Applicant thus respectfully submit that independent claims 4 and 11 are in condition for allowance and urge reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections thereto. Claims 5-6, 8 and 10 depend from claim 4. As nothing in the references cure their deficiency as applied to claim 4,

Applicant urges claim 5-6, 8 and 10 are also in condition for allowance and urge reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections thereto.

Finally, independent claims 1, 4 and 11 each recite: “[A] wireless LAN base station device” that includes, “plural antennas for making communication with a wireless terminal,” “plural transmission-reception portions connected to said plural antennas,” and “plural control processors for controlling said plural transmissions-reception portions.” For the reasons amply discussed in Applicants’ Response dated June 11, 2007 (“the June Response”), the entirety of which is incorporated by reference herein, Trompower and Arai alone or in combination do not disclose these limitations.

In response to the Applicants’ remarks, at page 2 the Office Action also alleges Arai teaches a plurality of processors controlling transceivers at column 3, line 19-column 4, line 9 and Figures 1-2. Applicants disagree. At page 4, the Office Action identifies elements 102 and 103 of Figure 2 as “plurality of processors,” and element 101 as a transceiver. First, Applicants note that Figure 2 of Arai discusses a terminal, and not a base station, as required by the claims. Therefore, Applicants address elements 101, 102 and 103 of Figure 1, as Figure 1 discloses a base station. Arai nonetheless fails to disclose the claimed “plural control processors for controlling said plural transmission-reception portions.”

As amply explained in the June Response, Applicants disagree that Arai’s units 102 and 103 correspond to the claimed control processors. As described above, the claimed control processors control the plurality of transmission-reception portions, yet column 3, line 17-28 of Arai show that elements 102 and 103 are not control processors at all. Rather element 102 is a signal processing unit (modem) and element 103 is a time division processing unit, which performs modulation and demodulation of time division multiplexed signals. Indeed, if Arai were combined with Trompower, result would simply add Arai’s TDMA capabilities to Trompower’s CDMA system. Hence, elements 102 and 103 of Arai are signal processors, they are not the claimed “plural control processors for controlling said plural transmission-reception portions.”

Hence, neither Trompower or Arai, alone or in combination, teach “[A] wireless LAN base station device” that includes “plural control processors for controlling said transmission-reception portions,” as recited in independent claims 1, 4 and 11. All the dependent claims ultimately depend from these independent claims, and nothing in Trompower, Arai or Machida cures the deficiency of the Trompower and Arai references as applied to the independent claims. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of withdrawal of all the rejections.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed to be due for this Amendment. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: November 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Brian M. McGuire/
Brian M. McGuire
Registration No.: 55,445
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant